

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 16, 2007. Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 17 and 19 to 21 remain in the application, with Claims 7 and 18 having been cancelled. Claims 1 and 12 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Applicants and their undersigned attorney thank Examiner Tsui for his courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded during an interview conducted by telephone on June 27, 2007. Also present at the interview was Supervisory Examiner Steven Hong. Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview follows.

At the interview, amendments to Claims 1 and 12 were proposed to incorporate the substance of Claims 7 and 18, respectively, along with other changes to address § 112 issues. During the interview, attention was focused particularly on how those amendments distinguished the present invention from U.S. Publication No. 2002/0120634 (Min). Examiners Hong and Tsui agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection over Min.

Examiner Tsui also agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of Claims 1 and 12. In addition, Examiners Hong and Tsui indicated that it would not be necessary to change "managing" to "linking", as originally proposed.

Therefore, in accordance with the agreements made at the interview, Claims 1 and 12 have been amended in accordance with the proposed amendments, with the

exception that Applicants have retained "managing" instead of "linking", as discussed at the interview. Correspondingly, Claims 7 and 18 have been cancelled.

At the interview, Examiner Hong also indicated that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection could be overcome without amendment by identifying a representative device from the specification which corresponds to one of Claim 1's "units". Accordingly, Applicants submit that one embodiment of Claim 1's "control unit" is described at, for example, Figure 3 and page 7 of the specification, which explains that "CPU 101 serves as a system controller, and controls the overall image processing apparatus 100", and "[CPU 101's] control program is used to implement the embodiment."

With respect to remaining issues raised in the Office Action, the Abstract was objected to for alleged failure to commence on a separate sheet. This objection is traversed, since it is Applicants' understanding, confirmed via the USPTO PAIR website, that the submitted abstract begins on page 30 of the specification apart from any other text. Nevertheless, a replacement Abstract is provided in this Amendment. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Turning to a formal matter, Applicants note that the Office Action does not explicitly acknowledge receipt of a certified copy of the priority document, although the Office Action acknowledges Applicants' claim to foreign priority. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the next communication acknowledge receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

In light of the agreements made during the interview and the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request same.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Michael J. Guzniczak  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 59,820

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1430769v1